

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 10-27 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 14, 15, 25 and 27 have been amended as shown at pages 3-7 of the Reply. In addition, the specification has been amended as indicated at page 2.

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Nguyen for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interviews conducted on March 15, 2007. Examiner was contacted to discuss the amendments to overcome rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 and interpretation of the cited prior art reference Stanley (US6,219,742) with respect to the limitations of independent claim 1.

Examiner provided suggestions regarding possible amendments to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101. Amendments along those lines have been made to independent claims 1, 14, 25 and 27. The Examiner also indicated that the cited reference may not anticipate the limitations in claim 1 with respect to three parameter buffer access read and write..

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection to Title

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The title has been amended as indicated above to be more descriptive of the claims. Therefore, this objection should be withdrawn.

I. Objection of Claims 1, 4, 14, 15, 25 and 27

Claims 1, 4, 14, 15, 25 and 27 are objected to because of the following informalities: the abbreviations used in these claims should be defined, and "The system of claim 1" (claim 4, line 1) should read "The system of claim 3". Independent claims 1, 15, 25 and 27 have been amended to define the abbreviated terms. Claim 4 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly , this objection should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-8, 10-14 and 25-27 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-8, 10-14 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claims 1, 14, 25 and 27 have been amended in line with suggestions provided during the telephonic interview. As such, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-8 and 10-27 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-8 and 10-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Stanley (US 6,219,742). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Stanley does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of appellants' claimed invention.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it expressly or inherently describes *each and every* limitation set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The subject application relates to SMBus (System Management Bus) event notification handling and relates more particularly to handling SMBus event notification in ASL (ACPI Source Language) code, which is compiled into AML (ACPI Machine Language) code eliminating the need for the ASL code to manipulate lower level hardware, such as an embedded controller. Furthermore, appellants' claimed invention teaches three parameter buffer access read and write methods capable of transferring variable sized blocks that allow for more efficient and simplified data transfers. In particular, independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 14, 15 and 25) recites *an AML event handler component; and, a driver component that identifies an SMBus event and dispatches the SMBus event to the AML event handler, where the AML event handler employs at least one of a three parameter buffer access read method to read data from an operation region associated with the SMBus and a three parameter buffer access write method to write data to an operation region associated with the SMBus.*

As indicated during the telephonic interview, Stanley does not teach or suggest the aforementioned novel aspects of appellants' invention as recited in the subject claims. Stanley teaches a system for setting general purpose event register bits through software instead of from the peripheral device through hardware. Stanley fails to disclose a three parameter buffer access read or write that is employed by the AML event handler. The section of the cited art referenced by the Examiner beginning at column 16, line42 discloses a method of employing software instead of hardware to set event notification bits in an event status register. Stanley is silent regarding a three parameter buffer access read or write and particularly one that is employed by an AML event handler.

Independent claim 27 recites *a data structure employed by computer implemented processes executing on a computer readable medium that facilitates dispatching an SMBus event to an AML code event handler, the data structure comprising: at least one indexed AML code entry point; and at least one AML event handler entry point associated with the at least one indexed AML code entry point.* Stanley is silent regarding a data structure that contains at least one indexed AML code entry point; and at least one AML event handler entry point associated with the at least one indexed AML code entry point. The cited reference discloses an AML code entry point. However, Stanley fails to teach a data structure that comprise and AML code entry point *and an AML event entry point associated with the AML code entry point.*

In view of at least the above, it is respectfully submitted that Stanley does not teach or suggest applicants' invention as recited in independent claims 1, 14, 15, 25, and 27 (and claims 2-8, 10-13, 16-24 and 26 which respectively depend there from) and thus fails to anticipate the subject claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP302US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TURCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TURCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731